

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1-5, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 21-24. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the present application.

For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the drawings for not being readable, Applicant has included herein replacement sheets for the drawings with formalized versions of the drawings. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. More particularly, in both rejections, the Examiner asserts that the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter of "long term", "opaque data types", and "library control functions" are not defined, making these claimed features indefinite. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In the background of the specification on page 2, line 16+, Applicant discusses opaque data types, giving examples including character large objects, and further discusses that as complex data, the access and update of the opaque data types takes longer than for basic data types, thus being long term, extended periods of access. With regard to the library control functions, Applicant describes the functions for long term, update and edit control in a database system on page 5, line 5+, as being provided as user-defined functions, which generally refer to

functions that are defined to the database management system and can be referenced thereafter in SQL queries or alternatively, are defined through standard techniques as a built-in function within a database system. In view of at least these portions of the specification, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter is defined in the specification and is not indefinite.

Further, Applicant has amended claims 1-5, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 21-24 to include these descriptions of these claimed subject matter as set forth in the specification to more particularly recite the features of the present invention. For example, Applicant has removed the phrase “long term” in claims 1, 11, and 21 and has instead recited update and edit control over an extended time period. Additionally, the amendments to claims 4, 14, and 23 present more particularly the creation of control tables for each selected table that contains columns enabled for control under the library control functions, as described with reference to step 32 of Fig. 3 on page 5. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments and that the scope of the claims has not changed. Further, in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraph.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hammack et al (“Hammack”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

The Examiner contends that Hammack discloses a database management function that can support utilization of library control functions via the SQL statement to ensure the data integrity for the database by teaching a SQL server, a library folder, and a rollback command. Applicant respectfully submits that these features of Hammack do not teach or even remotely suggest the recited invention. Particularly, the library folder relied upon by the Examiner is


described as an icon in a hierarchy frame of a displayed window that merely includes information utilized during a process design (see col. 6, line 25+). Applicant fails to see how a displayed folder icon in a displayed interface for information utilized during a process design teaches or suggests functions utilized via SQL statements. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that there is nothing to teach or suggest the utilization of library control functions via SQL statements, as recited in independent claims 1, 11, and 21 and included through dependency in claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-29. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Hammack fails to anticipate or even remotely suggest the recited invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

March 17, 2004  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 30,801  
(650) 493-4540